



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHAT AILS THE CHURCH?

THOMAS N. CARVER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I remember a certain country church in a Western State as it was about forty years ago. It was a plain, wooden structure with uncushioned seats, uncarpeted floors, and with plain glass windows through which the farmers could keep an eye on their horses, hitched to the racks outside. The men and boys sat on one side of the central aisle, while the women and girls sat on the other, and there were about as many on one side as on the other. The congregation was made up mostly of farmers and their families, who came to church in farm wagons, drawn by work horses. The father and mother in each case usually sat on the spring seat, while the children and the hired men sat on seat-boards, sometimes indulging in the luxury of a cushion made by folding a quilt. Within the church the elderly men sat in the "Amen corner," and the elderly women sat in the opposite corner. The small boys, for some reason which I did not then understand, sat with their fathers instead of with other boys of their own age.

The services were rather plain and unpretending, with little adornment or embellishment. There was no choir, though a small reed organ had recently been purchased. The singing, which was by the whole congregation, had considerable volume to it. I am told by my elders that it used to make me cry; but that is further back than I can remember. You will probably infer that there was a good deal of it, such as it was. It seemed to come up out of the very viscera of the congregation. I do not remember very much about the

preaching, as there were some other and very important things to occupy the mind of a small boy at that period. I remember, however, that the preacher used his arms and his voice pretty violently, and I can distinctly remember seeing the roof of his mouth a good portion of the time. I remember also that he said a good deal about death and the Judgment, but more about the joys of religion, which used to puzzle me a good deal.

Probably none of us would be satisfied with a church or a religious service of that kind today. Nevertheless, one thing stands out in my memory of that church, not only at the time of which I am now writing, but for a number of years later. It did not give one the impression of being run solely for the purpose of apologizing for its own existence. I can faintly remember the day the church building was dedicated. It was the one theme of conversation in the neighborhood for an indefinite period—an aeon it seemed to me—before and after the event. The impression which formed itself in my mind was that “The Dedication” was an event in the same class with the Creation and the Day of Judgment.

I have attended a number of country churches in different parts of the country during the last decade, and the one I am about to describe is typical of many if not all of them. There are some outward evidences of financial prosperity, such as cushioned seats, carpeted floors, and stained windows. Carriages and automobiles have taken the place of the old farm wagons, though they are fewer in number. The singing is done mainly by a choir, though a few straggling singers from the congregation join in a faltering sort of way. The hymns are seldom chosen from among the great classics, but frequently from cheap song-books published by commercial publishers of religious literature. One in particular remains in my memory as a kind of nightmare—some mawkish verses sung to the tune of “Old Black Joe.”

The sermon was less vociferous and probably in better taste than those of forty years ago. By some peculiar irony, one sermon which I recently heard in such a church as I am now describing was an attempt to show that since the Church was God's own institution it could not possibly die. This was delivered in the face of the fact that the preacher's own church was obviously dying before his very eyes.

I do not wish to imply that all the country churches of forty years ago were so vigorous, nor that all those of today are so feeble, as those which I have described. Nevertheless, it is my impression that there were then more country churches of the kind first described than there are now, and that there are now more than there were then of the kind last described. This impression is strengthened by the testimony of many men older than myself and with wider observation than mine. I think that there are few persons of wide observation who will deny that there has been a general decline in vigor, though exceptional neighborhoods and churches may be found which show the opposite tendency. The investigations of Mr. C. O. Gill prove conclusively that, in certain areas, this decadence has taken place.

What has happened? What has caused this change? It is easy to say that the change has come about because men do not believe what they once did. This is undoubtedly true. Whether we like it or not, we cannot honestly close our eyes to the fact that people do not believe as they did even forty years ago. Yet if this were all, we should find the liberal churches either progressing, or at least decaying less rapidly than the more narrowly orthodox churches. Since the opposite is the case, something more than a change of belief must be found to account for the decline.

Growing out of the change of belief perhaps, but more important than that, is the loss of a definite, soul-com-

selling purpose or program. Formerly the Church knew exactly what it was for; now it does not seem quite certain. Then there was no wavering; now those churches which are not merely drifting are running around in a circle looking for some "cause" to espouse, or something vaguely called "social service" to perform. Then the Church preached a clear and definite gospel of salvation, with damnation as the unattractive, though varyingly emphasized alternative; now it is not considered quite polite in the best religious circles to mention damnation, and, since there is nothing very definite to be saved from, salvation has lost its meaning. This is a change which has affected the liberal churches quite as much as the orthodox churches. Then their chief purpose was to combat the narrow and unattractive doctrines, particularly the doctrine of damnation, of the orthodox churches. Now, since the orthodox churches have practically, if not tacitly, abandoned those doctrines, the liberal churches, since they have nothing to combat, find themselves with as little to do as the orthodox churches themselves.

When men believed with all their hearts that the unredeemed soul was doomed to everlasting torment, while the redeemed were rewarded with eternal joy, the Church had one clear and definite purpose to fulfill. Moreover, this purpose was so big that all others shrank into pitiful smallness when placed beside it. The salvation of men was the biggest work there was in the world. What were the temporal affairs of this world in comparison with the eternal interests of immortal souls? What were industry and government, whose purpose was to promote temporal interests, when placed alongside the Church, whose purpose was to safeguard eternal interests? Talk about social service! What service deserved to be mentioned in the same breath with that of saving men, when the Church believed the doctrines of that

day? Any individual who professes to believe those doctrines and is not stirred with a mighty impulse to preach the gospel of salvation, who does not feel "Woe is unto me if I preach not," is either extremely hypocritical or cruelly selfish.

But why mince matters? The simple fact is that the Church does not really and in its heart believe in the old doctrines of salvation and damnation. There is an acid test which may be applied to determine this. Speak of the devil or hell, not in too coarse a manner, but as a bit of gentlemanly persiflage, before a body of preachers of any large or influential church. If your allusions provoke a smile, you may be sure that they do not take these names seriously. Or again, let any enlightened minister try to preach on these themes before any enlightened congregation. If he can bring himself to a genuine religious fervor, or, better still, if he can succeed in stirring his congregation to a genuine desire to "flee from the wrath to come," that will be an evidence that they really believe; if not, it will prove that neither he nor they believe. If, in the face of this evidence, they subscribe to a formal statement of belief in these things, you have evidence that they are self-deceived.

Whatever one may think as to the validity of this test, he will doubtless agree to the general principle that the Church, like any other organization, must have a program, a definite work to do, and that this work must be such as to appeal to the imagination of its members as being of vast importance. This, as it seems to me, is precisely what the Church today lacks. I realize, however, that two objections will be raised to this point of view. In the first place, it will be insisted that the Church has been urging its people to work, that we have been singing, "Work, for the night is coming," etc., for many years. In the second place, it will

be pointed out that all the churches have practically adopted the program of "social service," and that they are earnestly engaged today in carrying out such a program.

To the first of these objections I reply that it is not enough to preach a gospel of work unless you mention the job at which you expect people to work. Instead of merely singing, "Work, for the night is coming," it is necessary to be somewhat specific and say (if the metre can be fixed up), "Improve this road, for the night is coming. Build this bridge, for the night is coming. Drain this swamp, improve this crop, for the night is coming." Under the old doctrine of salvation, Christian work had a definite meaning. It meant saving souls, persuading men to cease from doing evil and to begin doing good, bringing them into the kingdom. In the absence of some kind of a doctrine of salvation, it means little more than persuading them to join the Church. Under these conditions, the Church becomes very much like an initiation society, such as you would find in many colleges. Until the Church has a program which extends beyond the mere increase of its own membership, its program of work will consist merely in working for new members; these new members, in turn, will have no work except the work for more new members, in endless and unprofitable repetition.

Under these conditions, a religious revival is merely a round-up, and baptism merely a branding operation, each church aiming to get its brand on as many individuals as possible without assuming any great amount of responsibility for the work of breaking them in to useful labor. The missionary work of the church, together with a very limited amount of charity work, furnish at the present time the chief exceptions to this rule. But in so far as the missionary work merely consists of efforts to convert the heathen, it fails to be constructive. It is

only when it seeks not only to convert them, but to *convert them to more productive and useful lives*, to put a new economic and social vigor into *their every-day work*, that it can be regarded as positively useful. As to the charitable work of the Church, it is generally agreed that much of it is misdirected. The only really charitable work, the only work which really does a man any good, is that which makes him more useful, which succeeds in getting him to do what he ought to do.

This perpetual program for membership brings the Church under that class of organisms whose energy is all expended in keeping alive, in trying to save their own life. Such an organism ought to die, and in a rational universe it must eventually die. But an institution which forgets that it has a life to save, whose energy is expended not in trying to keep alive, or to save its life, but in trying to serve, which loses its life or its energy in service, ought to live, and in a rational universe cannot die. "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it."

This points undoubtedly to the principle of social service, and brings us to the second objection mentioned above. The trouble with the program of social service as ordinarily preached is that we have a very limited idea as to what social service really is. I think that it is safe to say that the idea of social service which is most generally accepted is that it consists in stopping our regular work and proceeding to do something else. This idea, carried to its logical extreme, would require that every individual should neglect his own work in order to do some one else's. Things would then be in a pretty mess. Surely we ought to be able to see that any useful work is social service. So long as potatoes are needed, it is social service to grow good potatoes, as truly as to live in a settlement-house or espouse a political reform.

Another popular idea of social service is summed up in the formula attributed to the late Professor Sumner—"A conferring with B as to what C ought to do for D." Very few discussions of social reform ever get beyond that formula. That is particularly true of the efforts of religious bodies, social service institutes, and similar organizations.

What a spectacle it is to see so many religious organizations running from one thing to another, in a fever of anxiety to stand in with "labor," to array themselves on the side of God and sociology, to find some "advanced" position or "progressive" principle to defend! What is the use of talking about advancement or progress until you have a clear and comprehensive idea as to what progress really is? We are always prone to imagine that the direction in which we are already headed is the path of progress and human advancement, even though we are headed straight toward perdition. When we realize that nations have declined about as often as they have advanced, and that they have always thought that they were advancing, we shall become somewhat less cock-sure in our use of the word "progressive."

With political and social changes it is very much as it is with fashions. When we have become tired of one style of dress, one school of art, or one type of social institution, and are desirous of a new sensation, we invariably, unless we are old fogies like Cato and some others, regard the change which is actually occurring as progress. When one thing begins to bore us, and another thing attracts us by its newness, we think we are progressing. We get more pleasure from a new toy than from an old one; and from the point of view of the "pig-trough philosophy" of life, that is all we need to consider. From the very nature of the case, voluntary political and social changes must consist in the substitution of that which we like for that which we dislike. We may per-

suade ourselves that what the majority likes must necessarily be better than what it dislikes; but the majority never votes, for the excellent reason that it is not born yet. One of the most fundamental works of reform, more fundamental than any kind of legislation, is the persuading of men to like the right things.

A really constructive program must, of course, consist of something more substantial than talk, and more fundamental than dropping pieces of paper into a box. Speaking broadly, and allowing for a few exceptions, it is almost a rule that those countries, States, and cities in which most attention is paid to balloting and politics, are the least progressive or the most degenerate. There is no mystery about this. The larger the fund of human energy expended in running the machinery of government, the less there is available for running the industries, which are the real sources of human welfare and the objects for which governments exist. Sometimes, however, our ideas become so perverted that we begin to think that industries exist for the support of government. This is what leads to that worst form of modern idolatry, the worship of the Almighty Ballot, which is doing vastly more harm than the worship of the almighty dollar. Show me a community where the only themes of conversation are politics and doctrinal religion, and I will show you a community that is backward, unprosperous, and unprogressive. On the other hand, show me a community where the common themes of eager conversation are different forms of productive work and enterprise, and I will show you a progressive and prosperous community.

This suggests a constructive program of social service. Suppose that every time a doctor got religion he began to give himself to the study of medical science with a new zeal, and to the practice of the healing art with a new devotion. The more doctors there were who got

this kind of religion, the more rapidly medical science would advance, the better medical practice we should have, and the lower the death rate would be. Spreading this kind of religion would be a very good way of reducing the death rate. The man who would not try to spread such a religion would have something wrong with his mental and moral make-up, and would be a candidate for the madhouse or the jail.

Suppose that every time a farmer got religion he began to give himself to the study of agricultural science with a new zeal, and to the practice of his productive art with a new enthusiasm. The more farmers there were who got this kind of religion, the better agriculture we should have. The effective preaching of such a religion as this would be one of the very best ways of reducing the cost of living.

Suppose that every time a business man got religion he began to give himself with a new enthusiasm to the study of the science of business management, and with a new devotion to the art of business administration. The more business men there were who got such a religion as this, the better business conditions we should have, the more productive enterprises would be started, and the larger the demand for labor would be. Spreading such a religion as this would do more than anything now being done by any organization for the improving of industrial conditions and the elimination of poverty.

And suppose that every time a mechanic got religion he began to give himself with a new devotion to the study of the sciences underlying his trade, and with a new zeal to the application of his skill. The more mechanics there were who got this kind of religion the more rapid would be the advancement in the mechanic arts. Spreading such a religion as this would be one of the most effective means of promoting general mechanical improvement.

And so on through all the other occupations, trades, and professions, including that of the statesman; suppose that the spread of this type of religion made every one who came under its spell a better worker in his own field of useful endeavor, not only stimulating him to greater expenditures of energy, but leading him to conserve and utilize his energy in the most useful and productive ways, avoiding waste and dissipation, lavish consumption and ostentatious display, and all the other uneconomic vices. One would then be able to detect the spread of this religion in the vital statistics of the country, in the statistics of production, of the increase of capital and the rise in the rate of wages. In short, the more people we can save from going to waste, or the more we can put to work up to their highest capacity, the better community we shall have.

There is probably no one who would withhold his general approval of such a religion as this and the church which promulgated it. The only difficulty would be to get him to apply it to his own individual case. He would be compelled to admit, if he were at all reasonable, that it would be an excellent thing for the community if every one would accept the standards of such a religion, and each one, in his own way, render the utmost service in the way of useful work. He might even agree to act upon such a principle, provided, or whenever, all the rest of the community would begin. But the test would come when he was asked to act at once on the principle of larger service without waiting for others to begin. Then he might object and say, What is there in it for me? Why should I begin working harder at my trade, and giving better service, when others are not? What good will that do me? Where do I come in? etc., etc. Now a sound religion not only demands of each individual that he shall act upon that principle which would work best for the

whole community, provided every one acted upon it (that is what a moral principle is); it demands of him that he shall act upon it at once and continuously, and without waiting for anybody else.

This type of religion could base itself upon a very definite doctrine of salvation, which always implies a doctrine of damnation as its counterpart. This doctrine of salvation would be quite as clear-cut as the old doctrine but would differ from it in some particulars. Having a clear-cut doctrine of individual salvation instead of a vague doctrine of social service, the Church could preach to individuals with all of the old fervor, and would need no longer to make a spectacle of itself by running around in a circle trying to find something in the way of social service or political reform to espouse in order to justify its own existence.

A thing may be said to be saved when it is prevented from going to waste. If a man's life is going to waste, it is lost. If he can be prevented from going to waste and put to some use, he is saved. The only rational definition of immorality is the waste of human energy. That, and that only, is sin which results in the waste or dissipation of human energy. When a man's energy is being wasted, the man is to that extent going to waste, his life is to that extent lost, and he stands in need of salvation. Perhaps it would be better to say that the community needs his salvation. The most precious resource of any community is its fund of human energy. If that resource is wasted, the community will be impoverished. If it is saved, the community will be enriched. Here is a doctrine of salvation in which the whole community is vitally interested. This kind of a program of salvation is the greatest conservation program ever conceived.

Possibly we may conclude that we have been talking prose all our lives without knowing it. As a by-product

of the old gospel of salvation, men were taught such economic virtues as industry, sobriety, thrift, forethought, and mutual helpfulness. These are virtues because they are ways of economizing human energy. That is what a virtue is. Men have been taught to avoid such uneconomic vices as sloth, drunkenness, riotous living, frivolity, and quarrelsomeness. These are vices because they are ways of wasting human energy. That is what a vice is. In so far as the churches have been means of promoting those virtues and discouraging these vices, of conserving human energy and turning it into useful channels, it has been performing the greatest possible social service. Compared with this kind of conservation, all other programs of social service are trivial.

This by-product of the old gospel of salvation, which some of our more ardent religionists have affected to despise, must become the chief end and aim of all preaching. "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." The wild, untamed energy of human nature, which tends too much to run riot, to waste itself in the pursuit of whims, to dissipate itself in vice or luxury, to consume itself in fruitless conflict, needs to be tamed, harnessed, and put to work. This is a task of even greater importance than that of taming and harnessing the winds, the tides, and the waterfalls.

Aside from those forms of waste forbidden in the decalogue, the leading types of wasted human energy may be grouped under five heads—idleness, vice, luxury, conflict, and distraction.

Idleness is universally condemned in those who need to work in order to earn a living. But the more capable the man is, either by heredity or training or both, the greater loss it is to society if he is idle. When the man of little capacity works, he adds but little to the product

of the community. Consequently, when he is idle he does only a little less well than he can. But when the man of large capacity works, he adds largely to the product of the community; consequently he does a great deal less well than he can when he remains idle. One is, of course, not idle merely because he does not work for a living. He may be doing very useful work and doing it voluntarily without expecting any material gain for himself. It is only when he fritters away his time in self-amusement, in trying to acquire a "gentlemanly appreciation" of literature, art, golf, and whiskey, or when he is perpetually trying to acquire "culture," with no idea of ever employing his acquired talents usefully, that he can be said to belong to the idle class.

The idle class shades off gradually into the leisure class. They who go to their offices at ten o'clock and remain until two, who require the rest of their time to enjoy their income, or to make use of the opportunities which their wealth and social position provide, are doing only about half as well as they might. They are half lost, and that half needs salvation. Again, when a man who is capable of highly productive work busies himself with the common type of social reform, and succeeds in persuading himself that he is tremendously busy, telling B what C should do for D, when he himself ought to be draining swamps, clearing fields, building factories, or doing something else to give D employment or to produce the means for satisfying his needs, he is doing very much less well than he might and needs to be saved from going to waste.

Vice must include not only those personal habits which dissipate the energy of the human body and weaken the will, but also anything which occupies the mind to the exclusion of useful work. Even a game or amusement which is otherwise harmless becomes a vice when indulged in beyond the point where it functions as

recreation or preparation for work. He who spends enough time in games and amusements to keep his working capacity at its maximum is doing as well as he can. He who spends more is doing less well than he can. The game which fascinates the mind and holds it under such a spell as to prevent the profitable utilization of one's time becomes, by that very fact, a vice. The man who succumbs to this temptation is going to waste and needs to be saved. The business of the Church is to save him.

One of the most persistent fallacies in the world is the idea that luxurious expenditure on the part of the rich is good for the poor. There is surely no peculiar merit in spending for luxuries rather than for useful things. If I should spend a dollar for an article of luxury, I do, to be sure, set labor to work making luxuries—to the extent of a dollar. But if I spend it for a tool, I also set labor to work—to the extent of a dollar—making tools. It is certainly at least as good for labor if I spend my money for tools as it is if I spend it for luxuries.

As a matter of fact it is a great deal better to buy tools. After the tools are made and I have them, the tools are serving the rest of the world. The world is thereafter better provided with tools, and its productive power is increased. Moreover, I have not only given employment to labor by spending my money for tools; I must thereafter employ labor to use them. A community which does not practise thrift and invest in tools is universally a community where labor is badly off, and from which it tends to emigrate. A community which practises thrift and invests in tools instead of buying luxuries is a community to which labor is glad to come. In other words, if I buy luxuries, I do less well than I can with my money, therefore I do ill. I am to that extent going to waste and need to be saved. The church which does not try to save me is not doing its work.

By conflict is meant not only brawling and litigation, but competitive consumption. When the farmers compete in growing crops, no harm and much good results. That is rivalry in well doing. It helps to feed the world. But when they and their families try to outdo one another in ostentation and display, or even to keep up with the pace set by other people in matters of consumption, nothing but evil results. Of all forms of competition, the only really bad form is competition in the consumption of wealth. More evils have their root in this soil than in any other. It is the source of more heart burnings, jealousies, and covetousness than any other single habit. It is competitive consumption which causes us to worry over our economic and social positions. It is not so much fear of coming to want as fear of not being able to live as well as our neighbors, or the fear that the world will not take sufficient notice of us, that drives men and women to strain every nerve for more income with which to make a show, or to do or say smart things in order to attract attention. This is what drives business men to unscrupulous methods of competition, and writers, actors, speakers, and sometimes preachers, to exaggeration, innuendo, and other methods of falsification in order to win notoriety. It is closely associated with both greed and vanity.

As between the two, the latter is probably the worse, though either is bad enough. A great popular preacher said recently that no man could succeed in business without being dishonest. He would have been no farther from the truth if he had said that no one could be a great popular preacher without being a liar. One who expects to prosper in business must, of course, get business. If he cannot get it honestly by reason of the excellence of his goods or service, he must get it, if at all, by fraud, false advertising, adulteration, shoddy, or some similarly dishonest method. Men do not usually

prefer dishonesty to honesty. They would probably prefer a small income honestly won to a large one dishonestly won, were they not driven as with whips by the fear of falling behind the social procession, the fear that they, and more especially their families, may be outshone by some one else.

The evils of this form of conflict have long been recognized. Well-meaning but misguided people have assumed that these evils are inherent in competition itself. Such people ought never to play a game of croquet, for there is competition there. Even an innocent amusement of that kind, however, becomes vicious when played solely for a prize, *and* when the prize is regarded as the one thing in the world worth possessing. He who comes between me and the one desire of my heart is my enemy, and I shall kill him if he doesn't watch. If the one desire of my heart is to win an athletic prize, my opponents are my enemies and they must beware. If we are all animated by that kind of a spirit, even a game of croquet is wickedly played. Similarly, when the one desire of my heart is social distinction, or even to keep up with my neighbors, and when my social position depends upon my income, the man who stands between me and my income, that is, my competitor in business, is my enemy. Where we are all in the same state of mind, business competition becomes a wicked game. Inherently there is no more harm in business competition than in an athletic contest. Both become equally bad when played with a bad spirit. Discriminating reformers, therefore, will not inveigh against either form of contest as such. They will try rather to get at the root of the difficulty by eliminating the source of the evil. Football, for example, degenerates into a brutal game when the students of each college come to prize victory above everything else, including honor. But when honor, courtesy, fair play, and genuine sport are prized more

than victory, even football becomes a game fit for gentlemen and Christians. The same spiritual change will clean up business competition. The church which preaches the right kind of religion, which creates a state of mind under which social position depends upon character rather than upon scale of consumption, or where men no longer compete in the consumption of wealth, will be doing more for the improvement of business and social conditions than all the tinkering socialistic reformers put together.

This form of conflict is very closely related to those forms of wasted energy which are grouped under the head of distraction. Few of us realize what a source of waste this is. Did you ever try to work out a difficult problem or do any severe mental work, in a room full of noise, conversation, and confusion? If so, unless you possessed remarkable powers of concentration, you must have found it hard to get anything done. The reason was not a lack of mental power, but the waste of that power by reason of its being scattered and spent upon other subjects besides the right one. When you went out into a quiet room, you accomplished your work without great effort. Your mind was no better in the quiet room than it was in the noisy one, and you did not expend any more energy, probably not so much. The reason was simply that you economized and utilized your mental energy, whereas, under the distractions of the crowded room, it was scattered, dissipated, or wasted.

The individual who has not the anchorage which religion ought to give, who does not see things in their larger relations, as a religious person ought to see them, who does not have a sense of the larger values, which a religious person ought to have, is like the person in a crowded room full of distractions. He does not realize what things are really worth while, therefore he allows trivial things to occupy his attention; he does not see the larger

aspects of life, therefore the petty things worry him; he does not feel his feet planted upon the larger truths, therefore he is blown about by conflicting winds of economic, social, and religious doctrine. A sound religion gives him a sense of quiet, of poise and balance; it enables him to enter the quiet room where problems become simple, and lessons easy. "The peace of God which passeth all understanding" is the first condition of the highest economy of human energy and the most productive life. To the individual who has thus freed himself from distraction, the yoke of service is easy and the burden of the productive life is light.

All this becomes perfectly clear to one who has grasped the full meaning of the two fundamental and antagonistic philosophies of life—the "work-bench" philosophy and the "pig-trough" philosophy. By the work-bench philosophy is meant that philosophy of life which regards the world as an opportunity for work, for the active joy of productive achievement. By the pig-trough philosophy is meant that philosophy of life which regards the world as an opportunity for consumption, for the passive pleasures of absorbing the good things which the world supplies. Under the former we consume in order that we may produce; under the latter we produce in order that we may consume. Under the former wealth is regarded as tools to be used in further production or usefulness; under the latter it is regarded as means of self-gratification. Under the former as wealth accumulates it is invested and put to work; under the latter it is gathered into barns in order that its possessor may say, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry."

He who has adopted the work-bench philosophy of life will obviously avoid idleness, vice, and luxury. Since he is intent upon production rather than consumption, on seeing how much he can put into the world rather than

how much he can take out, he will as naturally avoid destructive conflict as he will idleness, vice, or luxury. But precisely the opposite happens to him who has adopted the pig-trough philosophy of life. He continually tries to avoid work, and seeks idleness as soon as he is able to live without work. If one's purpose in life is to get as much out of it as possible rather than to put as much in it as possible, the manners and the morals of the pig-trough prevail as a natural consequence. And finally, the distractions of life have a peculiar hold upon people who are not anchored to a purpose outside themselves.

Though the work-bench philosophy of life differs from that which is vaguely called altruism, it produces very much the same results in conduct as altruism does when it is rightly understood. Suppose that you were a pure altruist, with no desire whatever except to be of the maximum service to the rest of the world. You would naturally look about to see where the greatest needs were. You would soon discover that there were two classes of needs; first, those of which the people are conscious, and second, those of which they are unconscious. When people are conscious of their needs, they are willing to pay for the service which satisfies them. When they are unconscious of them, they are naturally unwilling to pay for the service which supplies those needs. If you supply needs of the latter class, you must do it on a philanthropic basis. But if you would satisfy the former class of needs, those of which the people are conscious, you will find that your services will command a market price. If you decide upon that kind of service which supplies needs of which people are conscious, you will become rich and a capitalist, and you cannot help yourself. But while you are rich in goods you may remain poor in spirit, regarding your wealth as tools to be used in further production or service. But this will make you still richer. There is not a single step

in this process which you can avoid if you are a genuine altruist and have chosen to serve those needs of which people are conscious. You dare not remain idle, you must work even though you are rich. You dare not do a less useful if you are able to do a more useful work, though this will make you still richer because people will be willing to pay more for it. You dare not consume more of your income than is necessary to sustain your working capacity at its maximum, even though you accumulate wealth by your frugality. You dare not allow your accumulated wealth to lie idle so long as tools are needed in any industry which supplies needs, though you become a capitalist when you buy tools. You dare not invest in tools for which there is a small need if there is a greater need for tools of another kind, though men will pay more for the service of the latter. You dare not give either your own service free or that of your tools, if you see ways of utilizing the income which you might receive by adding to the world's stock of useful tools. And so on, up to your limit, you are under compulsion. Incidentally, you would be obeying in the fullest detail every teaching of the New Testament with respect to wealth.

A community in which every scrap of human energy was saved and applied to useful work would be the kingdom of God. It would in time prevail over all other communities by reason of its greater usefulness and its vastly superior strength. It would have within itself the power to become the chosen community, and would need no supernatural aid. A gospel of salvation which saves men from going to waste must be a vital factor in the creation of such a community. The church which preaches such a gospel effectively must necessarily become the true Church. It will need neither historical claims, miracles, nor any other advertising devices to establish its title.